arXiv:1704.02302v1 [math.OC] 7 Apr 2017

On Optimal Weighted-Delay Scheduling in Input-Queued Switches

Yingdong Lu
Mathematical Sciences Department
IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA
yingdong@us.ibm.com

Siva Theja Maguluri
H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology
siva.theja@gatech.edu

Mark S. Squillante
Mathematical Sciences Department
IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA
mss@us.ibm.com

Tonghoon Suk
Mathematical Sciences Department
IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA
Tonghoon.Suk@ibm.com

April 10, 2017

Abstract

Motivated by relatively few delay-optimal scheduling results, in comparison to results on throughput optimality, we investigate an input-queued switch scheduling problem in which the objective is to minimize a linear function of the queue-length vector. Theoretical properties of variants of the well-known MaxWeight scheduling algorithm are established within this context, which includes showing that these algorithms exhibit optimal heavy-traffic queue-length scaling. For the case of 2×2 input-queued switches, we derive an optimal scheduling policy and establish its theoretical properties, demonstrating fundamental differences with the variants of MaxWeight scheduling. Our theoretical results are expected to be of interest more broadly than input-queued switches. Computational experiments demonstrate and quantify the benefits of our optimal scheduling policy.

1 Introduction

Input-queued switch architectures are widely used in modern computer and communication networks. The analysis and control of input-queued switches is critical for our understanding of design and performance issues related to internet routers, data-center switches and high-performance computing. There has been a large and rich literature around scheduling in such computer and communication systems.

The MaxWeight scheduling policy, first introduced in [6] for wireless networks and subsequently in [3] specifically for input-queued switches, is well-known for being throughput optimal. However, the issue of

delay-optimal scheduling for switches is less clear. In [5], the MaxWeight policy is shown to be asymptotically optimal in heavy traffic for an objective function of summation of the squares of the queue length with the assumption of complete resource pooling. In [2], MaxWeight scheduling is shown to be optimal in heavy traffic for an objective function of the summation of queue length, under the assumption that all the ports are saturated. These results are extended to the case of incompletely saturated in [1], though still for the summation of the average queue length. Nevertheless, the question of delay-optimal scheduling in input-queued switches remains open in general, as does the question of scheduling with more general objective functions.

In this paper, we seek to gain fundamental insights on delay-optimal scheduling in input-queued switches where a general linear cost function of queue length (delay) is associated with each queue. The objective of the corresponding stochastic control problem is to determine the scheduling policy that minimizes the discounted sum of these linear cost functions of the expected delays. Our derivation of an optimal solution involves the partitioning of the state space into different scheduling policy decision regions, where we derive an optimal policy and establish structural properties of the associated value function for these regions. In the 2×2 input-queued switch model, we completely identify three scheduling policy decision regions of interest, namely the trivial boundary, the critical boundary and the interior. We show that the optimal solution in the interior follows the $c\mu$ policy. On the other hand, for all but trivial regions of the boundary of the state space wherein the optimal solution is obvious, we establish that an optimal policy consists of a switching curve that takes into account the arrival processes. In some specific cases, we derive the optimal switching curve. More generally, we introduce an approach to approximate the optimal policy switching curve and we show that this renders an asymptotically optimal policy. We note that some of these results can also be extended to the case of general $N \times N$ input-queued switches. Meanwhile, our optimal weighted-delay scheduling analysis and results for the 2×2 switch are the first of a kind and the fundamental insights that we gain from such analysis and results will be valuable for our understanding of general systems.

Another important contribution of this paper to gain key insights on the fundamental properties of MaxWeight scheduling in the above setting for general $N \times N$ input-queued switches. In particular, we extend the results in [2] and prove that a weighted-variant of the MaxWeight policy has optimal scaling in heavy traffic for a general linear function of the average queue lengths. Although the heavy traffic analysis involves an objective function consisting of steady-state average of queue length, which can not be directly translated into the objective function of our discounted optimal control problem in general, the connections between these two frameworks are well understood; see, e.g., [4]. For the special case of unit cost functions, our results show that an optimal solution of the discounted control problem consists of choosing *any* admissible scheduling decision in the interior of the state space, following an appropriate switching curve in the nontrivial boundary of the state space, and controlling the trivial boundary with a work conserving policy. Since the input-queued switch system tends to spend all of its time in the interior of the state space asymptotically in the heavy-traffic regime, and the MaxWeight scheduling algorithm as an admissible policy is consistent with the optimal solution for the interior region derived herein, our results provide further understanding of the recent results in [2] showing MaxWeight to be delay-optimal asymptotically in the heavy-traffic regime for the unit cost function. Our results also shed light on the delay optimality of MaxWeight scheduling and its variants in general.

We also performed numerous computational experiments that compare our optimal scheduling policy with variants of MaxWeight scheduling. Under a symmetric scenario with Bernoulli arrivals, we derive the optimal switching curve which renders a policy that is optimal for both the total discounted cost and the long-run average cost. The relative optimality gap between our optimal policy and the MaxWeight scheduling policy is shown to be larger for heavier traffic intensities. More generally, computational experiments with our asymptotically optimal switching curve policy suggest rapid convergence to the optimal policy. Analogous to the symmetric case, the relative optimality gap between our optimal policy and the MaxWeight scheduling policy is once again shown to be larger for heavier traffic intensities.

We next present the details of our mathematical model and formulation for the general $N \times N$ input-queued switch model in Section 2. Our analysis and results for variants of MaxWeight scheduling is provided in Section 3. Our analysis and results for optimal scheduling and structural properties in 2×2 input-queued switches are presented in Section 4, followed by many of our proofs collected in Section 5. A representative sample of our computational experiments provided in Section 6, followed by concluding remarks. Additional proofs are presented in Appendix A.

2 Model and Formulation

Consider an input-queued switch with N input ports and N output ports. Each input port has a queue associated with every output port that stores packets waiting to be transmitted to the output port. Let $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I} := \{(i,j) : i,j \in [N]\}$, $[N] := \{1,\ldots,N\}$, index the queue associated with the ith input port and the jth output port. Packets arrive at queue (i,j) from an exogenous stochastic process.

Time is slotted and denoted by a nonnegative integer $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ := \{0,1,\ldots\}$. At each time t, a scheduling policy selects a set of queues from which to simultaneously transmit packets under the constraints: (1) At most one packet can be transmitted from an input port; (2) At most one packet can be transmitted to an output port. We refer to a *schedule* as a subset of queues that satisfies these constraints.

A schedule is formally described by an N^2-dimensional binary vector $\mathbf{s} = (s_{ij})_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}}$ such that $s_{ij} = 1$ if queue (i,j) is in the schedule, and $s_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the set of all possible schedules:

$$\mathcal{P} = \left\{ \left[\mathbf{s} \in \{0,1\}^{N^2}\right] \ : \ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{j\in[N]} s_{ij} = 1, \ \forall i \in [N] \\ \sum_{i\in[N]} s_{ij} = 1, \ \forall j \in [N] \end{array} \right\},$$

and $\boldsymbol{S}^\pi(t) \in \mathcal{P}$ the schedule under policy π for period t. Let $Q^\pi_{ij}(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ denote the length of queue (i,j) at time t under policy π and $A_{ij}(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ the number of arrivals to queue (i,j) during $[t,t+1)$. The queueing dynamics under policy π then can be expressed as

$$Q^\pi_{ij}(t+1) \ = \ Q^\pi_{ij}(t) + A_{ij}(t) - S^\pi_{ij}(t) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{Q^\pi_{ij}(t)>0\}}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{A}}$ denotes an indicator function associated with event $\mathcal{A}$, returning 1 if $\mathcal{A}$ is true and 0 otherwise.

We assume that $\{A_{ij}(t) : t \in \mathbb{Z}_+, (i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\}$ are independent random variables and that, for fixed $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}$, $\{A_{ij}(t) : t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ are identically distributed with $\mathbb{E}[A_{ij}(t)] = \lambda_{ij}$. Define $\mathbf{Q}^\pi(t) := (Q^\pi_{ij}(t))_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(t) := (A_{ij}(t))_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}}$.

Our goal is to establish an optimal scheduling policy that minimizes the total discounted delay cost over an infinite time horizon. Given the relationship between delays and queue lengths, we henceforth focus on cost as a function of queue length. Specifically, the cost under policy π at time t is a linear function of the queue lengths at time t:

$$c^\pi(t) \ = \ \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}} c_{ij} Q^\pi_{ij}(t)$$

for the cost function constants c_{ij}. We are interested in the total discounted cost over an infinite horizon given by

$$J_\beta(\mathbf{q},\pi) := \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\beta^t \, c^\pi(t)], \quad \mathbf{Q}^\pi(0) = \mathbf{q},$$

with discount factor $\beta \in (0,1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}^\pi(t)$ following (1).

Observe from (1) that $\mathbf{Q}^\pi(t+1)$ is determined by $\boldsymbol{S}^\pi(t)$, which is under our control. A scheduling policy is *admissible* if the schedule $\boldsymbol{S}^\pi(t)$ at time t is based solely on information revealed up to time t, such as $\boldsymbol{S}^\pi(s)$, $\mathbf{Q}^\pi(s+1)$, and $\boldsymbol{A}(s)$ for all $s < t$. It follows from known results in Markov decision process theory [4] that there exists an optimal stationary policy, on which $\boldsymbol{S}^\pi(t)$ depends only on $\mathbf{Q}^\pi(t)$, and therefore we restrict our attention herein to stationary scheduling policies. Specifically, we seek to find a stationary scheduling policy with the following objective:

$$\text{Minimize } J_\beta(\mathbf{q},\pi) \text{ over all stationary policies } \pi. \tag{P$_\beta$}$$

3 MaxWeight Scheduling

In this section, we study the well-known MaxWeight algorithm [6, 3]. It is known [2, 1] that, in the heavy traffic limit, the MaxWeight algorithm achieves optimal scaling of the sum of all the queue lengths, and is within a factor of less than 2 from a universal lower bound. Since we are interested in the weighted sum of queue lengths in this paper, we consider a weighted version of the MaxWeight algorithm as shown in Algorithm 1 with weight vector $\mathbf{c}$. It is known that such weighted MaxWeight algorithms are throughput

optimal [**?**]. In other words, the switch system is positive recurrent under a weighted MaxWeight algorithm, as long as the arrival rates are in the interior of the capacity region. In order to study the **c**-weighted MaxWeight algorithm, we define the weighted dot product on $\mathbb{R}^{N^2}$ as

$$\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} \triangleq \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} x_{ij} y_{ij} \text{ for } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}. \tag{2}$$

Therefore, the norm of a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$ is $||\mathbf{x}||_{\mathbf{c}}^2 = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} x_{ij}^2$.

Algorithm 1 Weighted MaxWeight Scheduling Algorithm for an input-queued switch

Let $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$ be a given positive weight vector, i.e., $c_{ij} \geq 0 \, \forall i, j$. Then, under **c**-weighted MaxWeight algorithm, in every time slot, each queue is assigned a weight $c_{ij} q_{ij}(t)$ and the schedule with the maximum weight is chosen, namely

$$\boldsymbol{S}(t) = \arg\max_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{ij} c_{ij} q_{ij}(t) s_{ij} = \arg\max_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}} \langle \mathbf{q}(t), \mathbf{s} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} . \tag{3}$$

Ties are broken uniformly at random.

Without loss of generality, we assume that the chosen schedule is always a maximal schedule. If a nonmaximal schedule is picked, any links that can be added to make it maximal have a zero queue length. So, we add those links to the schedule to make it maximal, and this will result in an unused service on those links because there are no packets to serve.

We study the switch system when the arrival rate $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ approaches a point on the boundary of the capacity region such that all the ports are saturated. In other words, we consider the arrival rate as it approaches the face

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &= \left\{ \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N^2} : \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij} = 1, \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij} = 1, \forall i, j \in [N] \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N^2} : \langle \lambda, \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(i)} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} = 1, \langle \lambda, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(j)} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} = 1, \forall i, j \in [N] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(i)} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}, x_{ij} = \frac{1}{c_{ij}}, x_{i'j} = 0, \forall i' \neq i\}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(j)} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}, x_{ij} = \frac{1}{c_{ij}}, x_{ij'} = 0, \forall j' \neq j\}$.

We obtain an exact expression for heavy traffic scaled weighted sum of queue lengths under the weighted MaxWeight algorithm in heavy traffic. We use the approach in [1] with the dot product redefined as in (2). In order to obtain heavy traffic performance of weighted sum of queue lengths under the weighted MaxWeight algorithm, we first establish that the queue-length vector concentrates close to a lower dimensional cone in the heavy traffic regime, which is called state space collapse.

3.1 State Space Collapse

In order to establish state space collapse, we first define the cone $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}$ as a cone spanned by the vectors $e^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{e}^{(j)}$, and then

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2} : x_{ij} = \frac{w_i + \tilde{w}_j}{c_{ij}}, w_i, \tilde{w}_j \in \mathbb{R}_+ \right\}.$$

For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$, let $\mathbf{x}_{\|_{\mathcal{K}_c}}$ denote its projection onto the cone $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}$, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_{\|\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}} \triangleq \arg\min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}} ||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}||_{\mathbf{c}}$. The error after projection is denoted by $\mathbf{x}_{\perp \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}}$, namely $\mathbf{x}_{\perp \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{\|\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}}$. The space spanned by the cone $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}$:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2} : x_{ij} = \frac{w_i + \tilde{w}_j}{c_{ij}}, w_i, \tilde{w}_j \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

The projection of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$ on to the space $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{x}_{\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}}$ and the error after projection is denoted by $\mathbf{x}_{\perp \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}$. We then have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1 *Consider a set of switch systems under the* $\mathbf{c}$*-weighted MaxWeight scheduling algorithm, with the arrival processes parameterized by* $0 < \epsilon < 1$ *and maximum possible arrivals in any queue* $a_{\max}$*. The mean arrival rate vector is* $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\epsilon} = \boldsymbol{\nu}(1-\epsilon)$ *for some* $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in$ *Relint*$(\mathcal{F})$ *such that* $\nu_{\min} \triangleq \min_{ij} \nu_{ij} > 0$*. Let the variance* $\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(\epsilon)}\right)^2$ *of the arrival process be such that* $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(\epsilon)}\|^2 \leq \widetilde{\sigma}^2$ *for some* $\widetilde{\sigma}^2$ *not dependent on* ϵ*. Let* $\overline{\mathbf{q}}^{(\epsilon)}$ *denote the steady state random vector of the switch system parameterized by* ϵ*. Then, for each system with* $0 < \epsilon \leq \nu'_{\min}$*, the steady state queue-length vector satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\overline{\mathbf{q}}^{(\epsilon)}_{\perp \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}}\|^r\right] \leq (M_r)^r \ \ \forall r \in \{1, 2, \ldots\},$$

where $\nu'_{\min}$ *and* M_r *are a function of* $r, \widetilde{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\nu}, a_{\max}, \nu_{\min}$ *but independent of* ϵ*.*

The proof of the proposition is identical to the the proof of state space collapse in [2], once the dot product and norm are redefined based on (2) and the projections are understood to be with respect to the cone $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{c}}$. Therefore, we will not repeat it here.

When $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{1}$, we have the usual MaxWeight algorithm, and we have the state space collapse as in [2]. The capacity region and the maximal face $\mathcal{F}$ are not dependent upon the choice of the weight vector $\mathbf{c}$. However, for any positive weight vector the state collapses into the normal cone of the face $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the dot product defined by the weight vector $\mathbf{c}$. This cone depends upon the choice of the weight vector, and thus the choice of the weight vector "tilts" the cone of collapse.

3.2 Heavy Traffic Weighted Sum Queue Length

We now use the state space collapse result to obtain an exact expression for the heavy traffic scaled weighted sum of queue lengths in heavy traffic.

Theorem 3.1 *Consider the set of switch systems operating under the* $\mathbf{c}$*-MaxWeight scheduling algorithm described in Proposition 3.1. Then, in the heavy traffic limit as* $\epsilon \downarrow 0$*, we have*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{ij} c_{ij} q_{ij}\right] = \frac{1}{2}\left\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2, \boldsymbol{\zeta}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}.$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 = \left(\sigma_{ij}^2\right)_{ij}$*. The vector* $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ *is defined by*

$$\zeta_{ij} \triangleq \|(\mathbf{e}_{ij})_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}\|^2_{\mathbf{c}} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{ij}$ *is the matrix with* 1 *in* $(i,j)^{th}$ *position and* 0 *everywhere else.*

Proof The proof is very similar to the proof in [1], with the understanding that the dot product, norms and projections are with respect to the weight vector $\mathbf{c}$. Therefore, we will not present the complete proof, but highlight a few important steps. The proof is done by setting the drift of the function, $\|\mathbf{q}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}\|^2$ to zero in steady state. This then leads to an equation of the form

$$2\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, (\mathbf{s}(\overline{\mathbf{q}}) - \overline{\mathbf{a}})_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\|(\overline{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{s}(\overline{\mathbf{q}}))_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}\|^2_{\mathbf{c}}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{u}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}(\overline{\mathbf{q}})\|^2\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}^{+}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, \mathbf{u}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}(\overline{\mathbf{q}})\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right]. \tag{5}$$

Similar to the proof in [1], it can be shown that the LHS term in (5) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
2\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, (\mathbf{s}(\overline{\mathbf{q}}) - \overline{\mathbf{a}})_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right] &= 2\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, \boldsymbol{\nu}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, \mathbf{s}(\overline{\mathbf{q}}) - \boldsymbol{\nu}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right] \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} 2\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, \boldsymbol{\nu}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right] \\
&= \frac{2}{N}\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, \mathbf{1}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right] + 2\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, \boldsymbol{\nu} - \frac{1}{N}\mathbf{1}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right] \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \frac{2}{N}\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, \mathbf{1}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right] \\
&= \frac{2}{N}\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{1}\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right] - \frac{2}{N}\epsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{\perp \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}, \mathbf{1}\right\rangle_{\mathbf{c}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is orthogonal to the space spanned by normal vectors of $\mathcal{F}$, i.e., to the space $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}$. This renders (a). Similarly, (b) follows from the fact that $\boldsymbol{\nu}, \mathbf{1}/N \in \mathcal{F}$. The second term above can be shown to go to zero as $\epsilon \to 0$ using the state space collapse from Proposition 3.1. The RHS terms in (5) can be bounded similar to the proof in [1], and the proof is complete. $\square$

Corollary 3.1 *Suppose the size of the switch described in Theorem 3.1 is 2, i.e, we consider a 2×2 switch operating under the $\mathbf{c}$-weighted MaxWeight algorithm. Then, in heavy traffic, we have*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{ij} c_{ij} q_{ij}\right] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \sigma_{ij}^2 c_{ij} \left(1 - \frac{c_{ij}^2}{\sum_{i',j'} c_{i'j'}^2}\right).$$

Proof It can be verified that the following three vectors form an orthonormal basis for the subspace $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}$.

$$\mathbf{f}_1 = \sqrt{\frac{c_{11}c_{22}}{c_{11}+c_{22}}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{c_{11}} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{c_{22}} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\mathbf{f}_2 = \sqrt{\frac{c_{12}c_{21}}{c_{12}+c_{21}}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{c_{12}} \\ -\frac{1}{c_{21}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\mathbf{f}_3 = \sqrt{\frac{(c_{11}+c_{22})(c_{12}+c_{21})}{c_{11}+c_{22}+c_{12}+c_{21}}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{c_{11}+c_{22}} & \frac{1}{c_{12}+c_{21}} \\ \frac{1}{c_{12}+c_{21}} & \frac{1}{c_{11}+c_{22}} \end{bmatrix}$$

Calculating the norms of projections $\|(\mathbf{e}_{ij})_{||\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{c}}}\|_{\mathbf{c}}^2$ using these basis vectors provides the corollary. $\square$ It can be readily verified that when $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{1}$, this result matches with the result in [2].

For a general $N \times N$ switch system, there is no explicit expression as we have in the above Corollary. However, the limit can be calculated through the following procedure. Denote by $\mathbf{v}$ an N^2-vector with $v_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}^2$. Then, we can have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{ij} c_{ij} q_{ij}\right] = (TG^{-t}\mathbf{v})^T \Gamma (TG^{-t}\mathbf{v}),$$

where

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} I_{(N-1)^2} & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$$

with B an $(N-1)^2 \times (2N-1)$-matrix, C a $(2N-1) \times (N-1)^2$-matrix, and D a $(2N-1) \times (2N-1)$-matrix. Among them, C and D are basis for the last $(2N-1)$ vector. Furthermore, for $i = 1, \ldots, N,\ j = 1, \ldots, N^2$, we have

$$g_{(N-1)^2+i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c_{ij}} & j = i, i+1, \ldots, i+N-1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and for $i = 1, \ldots N-1,\ j = 1, \ldots, N^2$,

$$g_{(N-1)^2+N+i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c_{ij}} & j = i, i+N, \ldots, i+N(N-2) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Meanwhile, supposing the pair (q, r) to be the quotient and the remainder when $i = 1, \ldots, (N-1)^2$ is divided by N with the Euclidean algorithm, we then have

$$g_{i,(N-1)^2+j} = \begin{cases} -1 & j = q, r+1 \\ 1 & j = N^2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and its inverse

$$G^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{(N-1)^2} + B(D-CB)^{-1}C & -B(D-CB)^{-1} \\ -(D-CB)^{-1}C & (D-CB)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

T is an $N^2 \times N^2$ matrix, whose first $(N-1)^2$ diagonal elements are one, and all the other elements are zero. Lastly, $\Gamma = (\gamma_{ij}) = \langle g_{q(i),r(i)+1}, g_{q(j),r(j)+1} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}}$, where we use $q(i)$ and $r(i)$ to denote the quotient and remainder of q divided by N, respectively. Meanwhile, we know that, for any two pairs (i,j) and (k,ℓ), we have

$$\langle g_{ij}, g_{k\ell} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{\delta_{ij,k\ell}}{c_{ij}^2} + \frac{\delta_{i,j}}{c_{iN}^2} + \frac{\delta_{k\ell}}{c_{Nk}^2} + \frac{1}{c_{NN}^2},$$

when $(i,j) \leq (N-1, N-1)$ with $\delta_{ij,k\ell} = 1$ only if $i = k$ and $j = \ell$, zero otherwise; $\delta_{ij} = 1$ only if $i = j$, zero otherwise; and furthermore, for any $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$,

$$\langle g_{ij}, g_{N\ell} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} = \langle g_{ij}, g_{kN} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} = 0,$$

$$\langle g_{Nj}, g_{N\ell} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} = \left(\sum_{m=1}^{N} \frac{1}{c_{jm}} \right) \delta_{j\ell}, \langle g_{iN}, g_{kN} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} = \left(\sum_{m=1}^{N} \frac{1}{c_{mi}} \right) \delta_{ik},$$

and

$$\langle g_{Nj}, g_{kN} \rangle_{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{c_{jk}}.$$

4 Optimal Scheduling

Although some of our results and arguments hold for general N and regions of the decision space, we focus our analysis and results on the case of $N = 2$, and thus $\mathcal{I} = \{ (1,1), (1,2), (2,1), (2,2) \}$. To derive an optimal policy and its structural properties, we first establish the equivalence of our stochastic optimal control problem with one based on a reward for each period in terms of the number of packets served. Then we derive an optimal scheduling policy for different regions of the decision space which we partition into the trivial boundary, the interior, and the critical boundary. Most of the proofs of our results are deferred until Section 5.

For notational convenience, we write $\mathbf{s} \# \mathbf{s}'$ when the two schedules $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{P}$ do not contain the same queue; e.g., $\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \# \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ if $\boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \boldsymbol{\rho}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\rho} \in \mathcal{I}$. We also write $\boldsymbol{\mu} \# \boldsymbol{\nu}$ when the two queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{I}$ cannot be contained in any schedule; e.g., $(1,1)\#(1,2)$ and $(2,2)\#(2,1)$ in the 2×2 switch.

4.1 Maximizing Service Rate

The cost for each time period in problem (P_β) depends on the current queue lengths which involve both the arrival and service processes. We shall instead consider an equivalent problem that is based on a reward for maximizing the service rate, where the reward only depends on the current queue lengths and the service action. Specifically, upon choosing schedule $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}$ with current queue length vector $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, the reward function $r : \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|} \times \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined by

$$r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}) \ := \ \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}} c_{ij} s_{ij} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{ij} > 0\}}.$$

We associate a quantity with stationary policy π by defining

$$\tilde{J}_\beta(\mathbf{q}, \pi) \ := \ \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \, r(\mathbf{Q}^\pi(t), \boldsymbol{S}^\pi(t)) \right]$$

where $\mathbf{Q}^\pi(0) = \mathbf{q}$ is the initial state. Then we can construct an alternative optimization problem as follows:

$$\text{Maximize } \tilde{J}_\beta(\mathbf{q}, \pi) \text{ over all stationary policies } \pi. \qquad (\tilde{\mathrm{P}}_\beta)$$

Next, we show that if there is an optimal (stationary) policy π^* of $(\tilde{\mathrm{P}}_\beta)$, then π^* is an optimal policy of (P_β).

Proposition 4.1 *An optimal solution for problem* $(\tilde{\mathrm{P}}_\beta)$ *is an optimal policy for problem* (P_β).

Proof From equation (1), we have $c^\pi(t+1) = c^\pi(t) + \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}} c_{ij} A_{ij}(t) - r^\pi(t)$, where $r^\pi(t) := r(\mathbf{Q}^\pi(t), \boldsymbol{S}^\pi(t))$. Summing over t then yields

$$\begin{aligned} J_\beta(\mathbf{q}, \pi) &= c^\pi(0) + \beta \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\beta^t c^\pi(t+1)] \\ &= c^\pi(0) + \beta J_\beta(\mathbf{q}, \pi) + g - \beta \tilde{J}_\beta(\mathbf{q}, \pi), \end{aligned}$$

where $g = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t+1}\, \mathbb{E}[\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}} c_{ij} A_{ij}(t)]$ which does not depend on the policy π. Hence, we obtain $(1-\beta) J_\beta(\mathbf{q}, \pi) = c^\pi(0) + g - \beta \tilde{J}_\beta(\mathbf{q}, \pi)$, which implies the desired result. □

Now let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of all stationary policies. The maximum total discounted reward over $[0, n]$ is

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}) \;:=\; \sup_{\pi\in\mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{n} \beta^t\, r(\mathbf{Q}^\pi(t), \boldsymbol{S}^\pi(t))\right],$$

where $V_0(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$. We then have the following Bellman equation in the $(n+1)$th value iteration:

$$V_{n+1}(\mathbf{q}) = \max_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{P}} \left\{ r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}) + \beta \mathbb{E}[V_n((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \right\}, \qquad (6)$$

which is called the $(n+1)$*th value function.*

4.2 Trivial Boundary

For problem $(\tilde{\mathrm{P}}_\beta)$, we first derive a work conserving optimal scheduling policy for a subset of the state space $\mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$.

Definition 4.1 *A state* $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ *is in the* trivial boundary *if there exists* $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}$ *such that*

$$q_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{if } s_{ij} = 0. \qquad (7)$$

In other words, $\mathbf{s}$ *is a schedule that can serve packets in all nonempty queues in* $\mathbf{q}$.

Now our main result for the trivial boundary.

Theorem 4.1 *An optimal policy in every value iteration for* $\mathbf{q}$ *in the trivial boundary is to choose a schedule* $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}$ *that satisfies* (7) *at any time* t.

This theorem can be derived from the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2 *Any value function* V_n *satisfies*

$$\beta\, V_n(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{ij}) \le \beta\, V_n(\mathbf{q}) + c_{ij}. \qquad (8)$$

for any $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ *and* $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}$.

4.3 Interior Region

We next investigate an optimal policy for an "interior" subset of the state space. A state $\mathbf{q}$ is in the interior if there exists a schedule that produces a maximal reward value

$$r_{\max} := \max_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}}\{r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) : \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}\}$$

with respect to $\mathbf{q}$.

Definition 4.2 *A state* $\mathbf{q}$ *is an* interior point *if*

$$\max\{\, r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) : \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P} \,\} = r_{\max} \tag{9}$$

and the interior region *comprises the set of all interior points.*

The following theorem identifies an optimal scheduling policy for the interior, rendering the $c\mu$ policy to be optimal.

Theorem 4.2 *For* 2×2 *input-queued switches, an optimal schedule in any value iteration on an interior point* $\mathbf{q}$ *is a schedule* $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}$ *such that* $r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) = r_{\max}$.

For the $(n+1)$th value iteration, the above statement is true if V_n satisfies the inequality of the next proposition.

Proposition 4.3 *Let* $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ *be an interior point and* $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}$ *a schedule such that* $r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) = r_{\max}$. *Then, for any value function and any schedule* $\mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{P}$ *with* $\mathbf{s}' \le \mathbf{q}$, *we have*

$$r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) + \beta\, V_n(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s}) \ge r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}') + \beta\, V_n(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s}'). \tag{10}$$

4.4 Critical Boundary: $c\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is Optimal

In this section we start to consider the remaining region of the decision space, which we call the critical boundary, for the special case where only one buffer is empty and the $c\mu$ policy is optimal as in the interior region.

Throughout this section, let $\mathcal{I} = \{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\rho}, \boldsymbol{\omega}\}$ where $\boldsymbol{\mu}\#\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}\#\boldsymbol{\rho}$. Further, we assume $c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \le c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \le c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ where $\boldsymbol{\mu}\#\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}\#\boldsymbol{\rho}$. We then identify an optimal policy for state $\mathbf{q}$ such that $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = 0$ and all other queues are nonempty.

Theorem 4.3 *Let the state* $\mathbf{q}$ *be such that* $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = 0$, *all other queues are nonempty in any value iteration, and* $\mathbf{c}$ *is as assumed above. Then the optimal action on state* $\mathbf{q}$ *is to serve packets in queues* $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\omega}$.

For the $(n+1)$th value iteration, the above statement is true if V_n satisfies the inequality of the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4 *For any value function, we have*

$$c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \ge c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \beta\, V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) \tag{11}$$

for any $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$.

4.5 Critical Boundary: Switching Curve

In this section we consider the remainder of the critical boundary and show that an optimal policy of any value function has a switching curve structure.

Theorem 4.4 *Fix a state* $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$. **S1***: In any value iteration, if the optimal action on* $\mathbf{q}$ *is to serve queues* $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, *then these are optimal actions on* $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ *and* $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$. *Furthermore, if the assumption of* **S1** *holds, the optimal action on* $\mathbf{q}'$ *is to serve queues* $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ *if* $q'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \ge q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, $q'_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \ge q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, *and* $q'_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \le q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ *for* $\boldsymbol{\rho}\#\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

To establish the above theorem on a switching curve structure for the relevant portion of the critical boundary, we introduce in the next proposition inequalities that imply **S1**.

Proposition 4.5 *For every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the nth value function satisfies the following inequalities: For any $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$,*

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}), \tag{12}$$

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}), \tag{13}$$

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}), \tag{14}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\rho}, \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{I}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} \# \boldsymbol{\rho}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} \# \boldsymbol{\omega}$, and $\boldsymbol{\rho} \neq \boldsymbol{\omega}$.

5 Proofs

5.1 Trivial Boundary

We first show that Theoreom 4.1 follows from Proposition 4.2. Suppose that (8) holds for V_n. Let $\mathbf{q}$ be a state in the trivial boundary and $\mathbf{s}$ the schedule that satisfies (7). Then, for any schedule $\mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{P}$, we have

$$(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s}')^+ = (\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}'} \mathbf{e}_{ij},$$
$$r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}') = r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) + \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}'} c_{ij},$$

where $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}'$ if and only if $q_{ij} \geq 1$ (so, $s_{ij} \geq 1$) and $s'_{ij} = 0$. Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}') + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s}')^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] =& r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}') + \beta\,\mathbb{E}\Big[V_n\big((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \textstyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}'} \mathbf{e}_{ij}\big)\Big] \\ \leq& r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}') + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] + \textstyle\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}'} c_{ij} \\ =& r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Proposition 4.2. As a result, $\mathbf{s}$ is the optimal schedule for $\mathbf{q}$ in any value iteration.

Now we prove Proposition 4.2 by induction. Since $V_0(\mathbf{q}) = 0$, (8) holds for $n = 0$. Next suppose that V_k satisfies (8). Let $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}$ be a schedule.

i. If ($s_{ij} = 0$) or ($s_{ij} = 1$ and $q_{ij} = 1$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{ij},\mathbf{s}) &= r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}), \\ \beta\,V_k((\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{ij}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}) &= \beta\,V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{ij}) \\ &\leq \beta\,V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}) + c_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation follows from induction hypothesis.

ii. Otherwise (i.e., $s_{ij} = 1$ and $q_{ij} = 0$), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{ij},\mathbf{s}) &= r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) + c_{ij}, \\ \beta\,V_k((\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{ij}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}) &= \beta\,V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}). \end{aligned}$$

From **i.** and **ii.**, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{ij}) =& \max_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{P}} \left\{r(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{ij},\mathbf{s}) + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{ij}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})]\right\} \\ \leq& \max_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{P}} \left\{r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})]\right\} + c_{ij} \\ =& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}) + c_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that V_{k+1} satisfies (8) and by induction, the proof of Proposition 4.2 is complete.

5.2 Interior Region

We first assume that (10) holds for the nth value function V_n. Then, for any interior point $\mathbf{q}$ with a schedule $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}) = r_{\max}$ and any $\mathbf{s}' \leq \mathbf{q}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}) + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s} + \boldsymbol{A})] &= \mathbb{E}[r(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A}, \mathbf{s}) + \beta\, V_n(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{s})] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[r(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A}, \mathbf{s}') + \beta\, V_n(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{s}')] \\ &= r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}') + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{s}')], \end{aligned}$$

where the first and the last equations follow from $\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} \geq \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}'$ (which implies $r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}) = r(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{A}, \mathbf{s})$), and the second equation follows from (10) for V_n. Hence, Theorem 4.2 holds for the $(n+1)$th value iteration.

Now we prove Proposition 4.3 by induction on n. Let $\mathbf{q}$ be an interior point, $\mathbf{s}$ a schedule with $r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}) = r_{\max}$, and s' a schedule such that $\mathbf{s}' \leq \mathbf{q}$. First, for $n = 0$, (10) holds because $V_0(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ and $r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}) = r_{\max} \geq r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}')$ for any $\mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{P}$. Next, assume that V_k satisfies (10).

i. If $\mathbf{s}' \leq \mathbf{s}$, then (10) for V_{k+1} immediately follows from Proposition 4.2.

ii. Otherwise, we have $\mathbf{s}' \# \mathbf{s}$ in the 2×2 input-queued switch.

Since $\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s}'$ is an interior point, by the above argument, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s}') =& r(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s}', \mathbf{s}) + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}' + \boldsymbol{A})] \\ =& r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}) + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}' + \boldsymbol{A})] \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbf{s} \# \mathbf{s}'$, which implies $\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s}' \geq \mathbf{s}$. On the other hand, from the definition of the value iteration, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s}) \geq& r(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}') + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}' + \boldsymbol{A})] \\ =& r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}') + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}' + \boldsymbol{A})]. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore obtain

$$V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s}') - r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}) \leq V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{s}) - r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}'),$$

which implies that (10) holds for $n = k + 1$.
The proof of Proposition 4.3 is complete by induction.

5.3 Critical Boundary: $c\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is Optimal.

We establish Proposition 4.4 by induction on n. First, for $n = 0$, V_0 satisfies (11) because $V_0 = 0$ and $c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$. Now, assume that (11) holds for V_k.

i. Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} > 0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} > 0\}} \\ &+ \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})]. \end{aligned}$$

If $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} > 0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_n((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} > 0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_n((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. Otherwise, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} > 0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_n((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})] \\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} > 0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_n((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Proposition 4.2 and the last follows from the definition of the value iteration.

ii. Next, suppose that

$$V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) = c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})].$$

If $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})] \\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})] \\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Proposition 4.2 and the last follows from the definition of the value iteration. Otherwise, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})] \\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Hence, (11) holds for V_{k+1} and by induction, the proof of Proposition 4.4 is complete.

5.4 Critical Boundary: Switching Curve

We first show that the inequalities for V_n in Proposition 4.5 are sufficient conditions of **S1** in the nth value iteration when state $\mathbf{q}$ is in the critical boundary. Then, by symmetry, $\mathbf{q}$ falls in one of the three conditions:

C1: $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq 1$, $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = 0$, $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq 1$, and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = 0$;
C2: $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq 1$, $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \geq 1$, $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq 1$, and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = 0$;
C3: $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq 1$, $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = 0$, $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq 1$, and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \geq 1$;

where $\boldsymbol{\rho} \neq \boldsymbol{\omega}$ are queues that cannot be served with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

Proof for **C1**. From the assumption in **S1**, we have

$$c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \geq c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})]. \tag{15}$$

Substituting $\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq \mathbf{0}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (12) yields

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}).$$

Taking expectation of the above equation for $\boldsymbol{A}$ and adding this to (15), we obtain

$$c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})] \geq c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})],$$

which implies that the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.

On the other hand, for $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})] \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})] \\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})], \end{aligned}$$

where the first equation follows from Proposition 4.2 and the second follows from (15). Hence, the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.

Proof for **C2**. Assumption in **S1** and condition **C2** implies

$$c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})] \geq c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})]. \tag{16}$$

Substituting $\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq \mathbf{0}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (13) yields

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}).$$

Taking expectation of the above equation for $\boldsymbol{A}$ and adding this to (16), we obtain

$$c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})] \geq c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})],$$

which implies that the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is to serve packets in queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, and by symmetry this is also the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$.

Proof for **C3**. From the assumption in **S1**, we have

$$c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \quad \geq c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})]. \tag{17}$$

Substituting $\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \geq \mathbf{0}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (14) yields

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}).$$

Taking expectation of the above equation for $\boldsymbol{A}$ and adding this to (17), we obtain

$$c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})] \geq c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})],$$

which implies that the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.

On the other hand, for $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})] &\leq c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})] \\ &\leq c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})], \end{aligned}$$

where the first equation follows from Proposition 4.2 and the second follows from (17). Hence, the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ is to serve packets in queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.

In summary, statement **S1** of Theorem 4.4 holds in the nth value iteration, if V_n satisfies the inequalities in Proposition 4.5, the proof of which is presented in the next section.

5.5 Proposition 4.5

We prove Proposition 4.5 by induction on n, introducing new inequalities useful for proving inequalities (12)–(14):

$$2V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}), \tag{18}$$

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \quad \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}), \tag{19}$$

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}) \quad \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}), \tag{20}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\rho},\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\rho}\#\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\omega}\#\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\rho} \neq \boldsymbol{\omega}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \boldsymbol{\nu}$.

First, for $n=0$, all equations (12)–(14) and (18)–(20) hold because $V_0(\mathbf{q})=0$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$. Next, assuming that the kth value function satisfies all of these equations, we prove V_{k+1} satisfies the first three equations below and prove V_{k+1} satisfies the remaining equations in the appendix. Beyond the induction hypothesis on V_k, we need the following lemma, the proof of which is also provided in the appendix.

Lemma 5.1 *Suppose that* $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ *satisfy:* (a) $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ *and* $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$*, component-wise;* (b) $\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{z}+\mathbf{w}$*. Then, any value function* V_n *satisfies*

$$V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{x}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{y}) \geq V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{z}) + V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{w}), \tag{21}$$

for any $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$.

5.5.1 Proof of (12) for V_{k+1}

We prove (12) for $n=k+1$ where $\boldsymbol{\mu}\#\boldsymbol{\rho}$. The RHS of this equation is involved with the optimal actions on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration, in which case statement **S1** holds true because V_k from the Bellman equation (6) satisfies (12)–(14). Hence, if the optimal action of the $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, then so is this the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$. Further, if the optimal action of the $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}$, then state $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ has the same optimal action in the $(k+1)$th value iteration. We therefore have, in the $(k+1)$th iteration, the following three cases for optimal actions on those two states: (1) Both optimal actions are to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$;

(2) Both optimal actions are to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$; (3) The optimal action on $(\mathbf{q}+2\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, and the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. We prove (12) for the $(k+1)$th value function dealing with all three cases.

First, suppose that optimal actions on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ are to transmit packets in queue $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})] \\
\leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
\leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (12) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. On the other hand, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})] \\
\leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{22}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})] \\
\leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Proposition 4.2 and the last follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Second, assume that optimal actions on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ are to transmit packets in queue $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) \\
=& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
\leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{21}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{21}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (12) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. On the other hand, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) \\
=& c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\omega}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\omega}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
\leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\omega}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\omega}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (18) for V_k) and the last follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Finally, suppose that the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ is to serve packets in queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, and the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ is to transmit packets in queue $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration.

Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}\\ &+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{z})+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{w})],\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) \geq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}\\ &+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{x})+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{y})],\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Q}:=(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}$, $\mathbf{x}:=\mathbf{q}-(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, $\mathbf{y}:=\mathbf{q}-(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+$, $\mathbf{z}:=\mathbf{q}-(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, $\mathbf{w}:=\mathbf{q}-(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$. We also have $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\mathbf{w}\in\{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\mathbf{x}\leq\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, $\mathbf{y}\leq\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$, and $\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{z}+\mathbf{w}$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) \geq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}\\ &+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{x})+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{y})]\\ \geq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}\\ &+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{z})+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{w})]\\ =& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Lemma 5.1.

Hence, (12) holds for the $(k+1)$th value function V_{k+1}.

5.5.2 Proof of (13) for V_{k+1}

We prove equation (13) for $n=k+1$ where $\boldsymbol{\mu}\#\boldsymbol{\rho}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}\#\boldsymbol{\omega}$, $\boldsymbol{\nu}\#\boldsymbol{\rho}$, $\boldsymbol{\nu}\#\boldsymbol{\omega}$, $\boldsymbol{\rho}\neq\boldsymbol{\omega}$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}\neq\boldsymbol{\nu}$. The RHS of this equation is involved with the optimal actions on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ and $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration, in which case statement **S1** holds true because V_k from the Bellman equation (6) satisfies (12)–(14). Hence, if the optimal action of the $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, then so is this the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$. Further, if the optimal action of the $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, then state $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ has the same optimal action in the $(k+1)$th value iteration. We therefore have, in the $(k+1)$th iteration, the following three cases for optimal actions on those two states: (1) Both optimal actions are to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$; (2) Both optimal actions are to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$; (3) The optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ is to in queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. We prove (13) for the $(k+1)$th value function dealing with all three cases.

First, suppose that both optimal actions are to transmit packets in queue $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ in $(k+1)$th value iteration. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\geq 1$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})]\\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})]\\ \leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (13) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\geq 0$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}=0$, we

obtain

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})]\\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})]\\ \leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (12) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. Lastly, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})]\\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})]\\ \leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Proposition 4.2 and the last follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Second, assume that both optimal actions are to transmit packets in queue $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\geq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}\\ &+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}\\ &+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})]\\ \leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (13) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. On the other hand, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})]\\ \leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (19) for V_k) and the last follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Finally, suppose that the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ is to serve packets in queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, and the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ is to transmit packets in queue $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ in $(k+1)$th value iteration. Then, we

obtain

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ =&(c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}})\\ &+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{z})+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{w})],\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) \geq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})]\\ =&(c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}})\\ &+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{x})+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{y})],\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Q}:=(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}$, $\mathbf{x}:=\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, $\mathbf{y}:=\mathbf{q}-(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+$, $\mathbf{z}:=\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{q}-(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+$, $\mathbf{w}:=\mathbf{0}$. We also have $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\mathbf{w}\in\{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\mathbf{x}\leq\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, $\mathbf{y}\leq\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$, and $\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{z}+\mathbf{w}$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})\\ &\quad\leq V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})\end{aligned}$$

which follows from Lemma 5.1.

Hence, (13) holds for the $(k+1)$th value function V_{k+1}.

5.5.3 Proof of (14) for V_{k+1}

We prove equation (14) for $n=k+1$ where $\boldsymbol{\mu}\#\boldsymbol{\rho}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}\#\boldsymbol{\omega}$, $\boldsymbol{\nu}\#\boldsymbol{\rho}$, $\boldsymbol{\nu}\#\boldsymbol{\omega}$, $\boldsymbol{\rho}\neq\boldsymbol{\omega}$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}\neq\boldsymbol{\nu}$. The RHS of this equation is involved with the optimal actions on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration, in which case statement **S1** holds true because V_k from the Bellman equation (6) satisfies (12)–(14). Hence, if the optimal action of the $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, then so is this the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$. Further, if the optimal action of the $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, then state $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ has the same optimal action in the $(k+1)$th value iteration. We therefore have, in the $(k+1)$th iteration, the following three cases for optimal actions on those two states: (1) Both optimal actions are to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$; (2) Both optimal actions are to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$; (3) The optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. We prove (14) for the $(k+1)$th value function dealing with all three cases.

First, suppose that both optimal actions are to transmit packets in queue $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}\\ &+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})]\\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ \leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),\end{aligned}$$

the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (14) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. On the other hand, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}=0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})]\\ \leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ \leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Proposition 4.2 and the last follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Second, assume that both optimal actions are to transmit packets in queue $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration. However, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = 0$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = 0$, the optimal action cannot be optimal on $\mathbf{q} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, and thus one of $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ should not be zero. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq 1$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \boldsymbol{A} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
\leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),
\end{aligned}$$

the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \boldsymbol{A}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (14) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. If only one of $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ is zero, without loss of generality, assume that $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq 1$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = 0$. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \boldsymbol{A} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
\leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \boldsymbol{A}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (12) for V_k) and the last follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Finally, suppose that the optimal action on $(\mathbf{q} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ is to serve packets in queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, and the optimal action on $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ is to transmit packets in queue $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ in the $(k+1)$th value iteration. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} > 0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
=& (c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} > 0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) \\
&+ \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{z}) + V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{w})],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) \geq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} > 0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
=& (c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} > 0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) \\
&+ \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{x}) + V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{y})],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Q} := (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}$, $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$, $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$. We also have $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$, and $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{w}$. We therefore obtain

$$V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) \leq V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}),$$

which follows from Lemma 5.1.

Hence, (14) holds for the $(k+1)$th value function V_{k+1}.

6 Computational Experiments

In this section, we present a representative sample of results from computational experiments on the performance of the (asymptotically) optimal solutions to the optimization problem $(\tilde{\mathrm{P}}_\beta)$ in comparison with

variants of the MaxWeight scheduling policy in the 2×2 input-queued switch model. The case of symmetric arrival rates and unit costs across all queues is considered first, followed by consideration of the general case for the arrival-rate and cost vectors.

6.1 Symmetric Case

Our results above establish that an optimal policy follows the $c\mu$ rule in the interior region and in the trivial boundary while having a switching curve structure in the critical boundary. Hence, upon identifying the switching curve for the critical boundary, we have complete information about our optimal scheduling policy. An explicit characterization is possible in the case of unit costs ($c_{ij} = 1$) and symmetric arrivals where we assume a Bernoulli arrival process with the same rate $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda < 0.5$, for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}$ and all t.

For this symmetric case, the interior region comprises all states in which the queues $(1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ or the queues $(1, 2)$ and $(2, 1)$ are nonempty (i.e., the states in which the system can transmit two packets), whereas the trivial boundary comprises states with only one nonempty queue. The critical boundary consists of the states in which there are two nonempty queues but only one packet can be transmitted. We then have the following explicit characterization.

Claim 6.1 *For the symmetric* 2×2 *input-queued switch, an optimal scheduling policy to maximize discounted reward over the infinite time horizon is given by*
i. *Transmit two packets in the interior;*
ii. *Transmit a packet in the trivial boundary;*
iii. *Transmit a packet from the longest queue among the two nonempty queues when in the critical boundary.*

Proof The results **i.** and **ii.** follow directly from Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. The result **iii.** follows upon applying the arguments in the proofs of Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 4.5 to the symmetric input-queued switch, which we omit. □

Since the policy in Claim 6.1 is also an optimal solution to the problem (P_β) for any discounted factor $\beta \in (0, 1)$, the policy minimizes the long-run average queue length. Note that this policy is the same as MaxWeight scheduling except for the actions in the interior region.

To investigate the performance between both scheduling policies in this symmetric case, we present in Figure 1 results from computational experiments for the long-run average queue length, together with 95% confidence intervals, under various arrival rates $\lambda = 0.30, 0.35, 0.40, 0.45, 0.48$ taken over 100 samples, for both our optimal policy and the MaxWeight policy, which we denote by MWS. We observe from these and related



Figure 1: Long-run Average Queue Length

computational experiments that our optimal policy provides larger performance gaps over the MaxWeight policy in heavier traffic intensities (higher arrival rates). To quantify this gap, we present in Table 1 the relative optimality gap between MaxWeight scheduling and our optimal policy: {(MWS-OPT)/OPT}×100.

Table 1: Relative Optimality Gap

Arrival rate	Relative optimality gap
0.30	1.31
0.35	2.76
0.40	5.28
0.45	9.64
0.48	15.01

Note: For the highest arrival rate considered, our optimal policy renders a long-run average queue length 15% smaller than that of MaxWeight scheduling.

6.2 General Case

In contrast to the symmetric case, deriving an explicit switching curve is difficult in general because this structure depends on the discount factor β, cost coefficients c_{ij}, and arrival processes. Hence, instead of an explicit optimal solution, we investigate the performance of an approximate optimal policy based on value iterations, which we call the "Look-ahead policy" and show to be asymptotically optimal with respect to the look ahead. Throughout this section, let $\mathcal{V}$ denote the set of bounded real-valued functions on the state space $\mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|} \simeq \mathbb{Z}_+^4$ with norm $\|V\| := \sup\{|V(\mathbf{q})| \,:\, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^4\}, \quad V \in \mathcal{V}$. We also define $V_\beta^*, \tilde{V}_\beta^* \in \mathcal{V}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} V_\beta^*(\mathbf{q}) &:= \max\{J_\beta(\mathbf{q},\pi) \,:\, \pi \in \mathcal{M}\}, \\ \tilde{V}_\beta^*(\mathbf{q}) &:= \max\{\tilde{J}_\beta(\mathbf{q},\pi) \,:\, \pi \in \mathcal{M}\}, \end{aligned}$$

recalling $\mathcal{M}$ to be the set of all stationary policies.

6.2.1 Look-ahead Policy

As in Section 4.1, we consider value iteration on the optimization problem $(\tilde{\mathrm{P}}_\beta)$ starting with $V_0 = 0$. Then, we define the kth look-ahead policy π_k to be the policy that uses the kth value function as an approximation of an optimal solution. We therefore have

$$\pi_k(\mathbf{q}) := \arg\max \left\{ r(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{s}) + \mathbb{E}\Big[V_k\big((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{s})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}\big)\Big] \,:\, \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P} \right\}.$$

This class of look-ahead policies has several benefits, two of which we briefly mention based on our theoretical results.

i. Our optimal results for the interior and trivial boundary reduce the computational burden of the look-ahead policy. Policy π_k is the same policy that generates the $(k+1)$the value function. Since the optimal actions on states in the interior and the trivial boundary are known, we only need to find the actions for states in the critical boundary.

ii. For sufficiently large k, policy π_k is a good approximation to an optimal solution of problem (P_β). Since π_k is based on value iterations to solve $(\tilde{\mathrm{P}}_\beta)$, $\tilde{J}_\beta(\mathbf{q},\pi_k)$ is an approximation to $\tilde{V}_\beta^*(\mathbf{q})$. Furthermore, we prove that $J_\beta(\mathbf{q},\pi_k)$ converges to $V_\beta^*(\mathbf{q})$ as k goes to infinity in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1 *Let $V_0 = 0$ and let π_k be the policy produced by the value iteration for $k = 1, 2, \cdots$. Then, $J_\beta(\,\cdot\,,\pi_k)$ converges to $V_\beta^*(\,\cdot\,)$ as $k \to \infty$. More precisely, if*

$$\|V^{k+1} - V^k\| < \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{2\beta^2}, \tag{22}$$

we then have $\|J_\beta(\,\cdot\,,\pi) - V_\beta^*\| < \varepsilon$.

Proof From the proof of Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1-\beta)J_\beta(\mathbf{q},\pi_k) &= c^\pi(0) + g - \beta\tilde{J}_\beta(\mathbf{q},\pi_k), \\ (1-\beta)V_\beta^* &= c^\pi(0) + g - \beta\tilde{V}_\beta^*, \end{aligned}$$

where $g = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t+1} \mathbb{E}[\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}} c_{ij} A_{ij}(t)]$. Subtracting the second equation from the first yields

$$\|J_\beta(\cdot, \pi_k) - V_\beta^*\| = \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \|\tilde{J}_\beta(\cdot, \pi_k) - \tilde{V}_\beta^*\|.$$

On the other hand, from Theorem 6.3.1 in [4], we have that $\tilde{J}(\cdot, \pi_k)$ converges to $\tilde{V}_k$ and $\|\tilde{J}(\cdot, \pi_k) - \tilde{V}^*\| < \frac{1-\beta}{\beta}\varepsilon$ when (22) holds, which implies the desired results. □

6.2.2 Performance of Look-ahead Policy

We compare the performance of our class of look-ahead policies, for different values of k, with the performance of variants of MaxWeight scheduling. The standard MaxWeight policy, denoted by MWS, chooses a schedule that has larger total number of packets than the other schedule. The weighted MaxWeight policy, which we denote by C-MWS, chooses a schedule that has the larger weight than the other schedule where the weight is a linear function of the queue lengths and the cost coefficients; e.g., packets from queues $(1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ are transmitted when $c_{11}q_{11} + c_{22}q_{11} > c_{12}q_{12} + c_{21}q_{21}$.

To investigate performance among the various scheduling policies, we calculate the expected total discounted queue length of the kth look-ahead policy (with look-ahead step size k) and compare these results with those for MWS and C-MWS. Figure 2 presents a representative sample of these computational experiment results, together with 95% confidence intervals, under arrival rates $\lambda_{11} = 0.7$, $\lambda_{22} = 0.5$, $\lambda_{12} = 0.2$ and $\lambda_{21} = 0.29$, cost vectors $c_{11} = 2$, $c_{22} = 2$, $c_{12} = 10$, $c_{21} = 10$, and discount factor $\beta = 0.99$, taken over 1000 samples. We observe from these and related experiments (across various distributions for arrivals, various arrival rates, and various cost coefficients) that the performance of the look-ahead policy is close to the optimal performance when the step size k is greater than or equal to 4. (Results for $k = 6, \ldots, 10$ are nearly identical to those depicted for $k = 5$.) Table 2 presents relative optimality gaps between C-MWS and the look-ahead policies.



Figure 2: Total Discounted Queue Length

Table 2: Relative optimality gap

Step Size	Relative optimality gap
1	-31.76
2	-32.06
3	-2.30
4	14.06
5	16.07

We further observe from these and related experiments that the look-ahead policies are good approximations to the optimal solution of problem (P_β) even when the step size is relatively small, where the optimality gap varies from 7% to 16% depending on the experimental settings.

7 Conclusions

In this paper we investigated an input-queued switch scheduling problem in which the objective is to minimize a linear function of the queue-length vector. Within this context theoretical properties of variants of the well-known MaxWeight scheduling algorithm were established, which includes showing that these algorithms exhibit optimal heavy-traffic queue-length scaling. We derived an optimal scheduling policy and established its theoretical properties for 2×2 input-queued switches, demonstrating fundamental differences with the variants of MaxWeight scheduling. Computational experiments demonstrated and quantified the benefits of our optimal scheduling policy. We expect our results to be of interest more broadly than input-queued switches.

References

[1] S. T. Maguluri, S. K. Burle, and R. Srikant. Optimal heavy-traffic queue length scaling in an incompletely saturated switch. *Preprint*, 2016.

[2] S. T. Maguluri and R. Srikant. Heavy traffic queue length behavior in a switch under the maxweight algorithm. *Stoch. Syst.*, 6(1):211–250, 2016.

[3] N. McKeown, V. Anantharam, and J. Walrand. Achieving 100 In *INFOCOM '96. Fifteenth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer Societies. Networking the Next Generation. Proceedings IEEE*, volume 1, pages 296–302 vol.1, Mar 1996.

[4] M. L. Puterman. *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*. John Wiley and Sons, 2005.

[5] A. L. Stolyar. Maxweight scheduling in a generalized switch: State space collapse and workload minimization in heavy traffic. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 14(1):1–53, 02 2004.

[6] L. Tassiulas and A. Ephremides. Stability properties of constrained queueing systems and scheduling policies for maximum throughput in multihop radio networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 37:1936âĂŞ1948, 1992.

A Additional Proofs

A.1 Proof of (18) for V_{k+1}

We prove that equation (18) for $n = k+1$ holds in each case depending on the three optimal actions of the $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. In particular, from Theorem 4.4 for the $(k+1)$th value iteration, serving queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ on $\mathbf{q}$ and serving queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ cannot be optimal at the same time.

First, assume that both optimal actions are serving queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
\leq& 2\, V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (18) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. On the other hand, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\leq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
\leq& 2\, V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Proposition 4.2.

Second, suppose that the optimal actions are serving queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) =& 2(c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\leq& 2(c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}) \\
&+ 2\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\leq& 2\, V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (18) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Finally, assume that the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, and the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}} \\
&+ \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
=& (c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{z}) + V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{w})],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
2V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \geq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}} \\
&+ \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
=& (c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{x}) + V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{y})],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Q} := (\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}$, $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$, $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+$, $\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+$, $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$. We also have $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$, and $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{w}$. We therefore obtain

$$2V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \geq V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q})$$

which follows from Lemma 5.1.

Hence, (18) holds for the $(k+1)$th value function V_{k+1}.

A.2 Proof of (19) for V_{k+1}

We prove that equation (19) for $n = k+1$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ can be served simultaneously, holds in each case depending on the three optimal actions of the $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$. In particular,

From Theorem 4.4 for the $(k+1)$th value iteration, serving queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ on $\mathbf{q}$ and serving queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ on $\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ cannot be optimal at the same time.

First, assume that both optimal actions are serving queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}>0$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ \le& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})]\\ \le& V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})+V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (19) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. On the other hand, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}>0$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ \le& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})]\\ \le& V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})+V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (18) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. Lastly, if $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}=0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ \le& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}+\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ &+c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}+\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q}+\boldsymbol{A})]\\ \le& V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})+V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Proposition 4.2.

Second, suppose that both optimal actions are serving queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})\\ &=2(c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}})\\ &\quad+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\ &\quad+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})]\\ &\le 2(c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}})\\ &\quad+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})]\\ &\quad+\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})]\\ &\le V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})+V_n(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (19) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Finally, assume that the optimal action on $\mathbf{q}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, and the optimal action on

$\mathbf{q} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ is to serve queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}} \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
=& (c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{z}) + V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{w})],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
V_n(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \geq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}} \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
=& (c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{x}) + V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{y})],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Q} := (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}$, $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+$, $\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+$, $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{0}$. We also have $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$, and $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{w}$. Therefore, we obtain

$$V_n(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_n(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \geq V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + 2\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q})$$

which follows from Lemma 5.1.

Hence, (19) holds for all value functions.

A.3 Proof of (20) for V_{k+1}

We prove that equation (20) for $n = k+1$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ can be served simultaneously, holds in each case depending on the three optimal actions of the $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$.

First, suppose that the optimal actions of $(k+1)$th value iteration on $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ are to serve packets in queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) =& 2(c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})] \\
\leq& 2(c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}>0\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})] \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
\leq& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (20) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Second, assume that both optimal actions are to serve packets in queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(1 + \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}>0\}}) + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(1 + \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
=& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(1 + \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}>0\}}) + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(1 + \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{z}) + V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{w})],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}) \geq& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(1 + \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}>0\}}) + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(1 + \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] + \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
=& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(1 + \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}>0\}}) + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(1 + \mathbb{I}_{\{q_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}>0\}}) \\
&+ \beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{x}) + V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{y})],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Q} := (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}$, $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$, $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^+$, $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{q} - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$. We also have $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, $\mathbf{y} \le \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$, and $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{w}$. Therefore, we obtain

$$V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}) \ge V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}),$$

which follows from Lemma 5.1.

Finally, suppose that the two optimal actions are different from each other. Then, by symmetry, we can assume that the optimal action on $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ is to serve packets in queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, and the optimal action on $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is to serve packets in queues $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. Thus, at least one of $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ is nonzero. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} > 0} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} > 0} \\
&+ \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\le& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} > 0} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} > 0} \\
&+ \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
\le& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from Proposition 4.2. On the other hand, we now assume that $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \ge 1$. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \ge 1$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \ge 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\le& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})] \\
\le& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (14) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration. If $q_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \ge 1$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) =& c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})] \\
\le& c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A})] \\
&+ c_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}})] \\
\le& V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis (substituting $\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{A} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ for $\mathbf{q}$ in (12) for V_k) and the last equation follows from the definition of the value iteration.

Since (20) holds for V_{k+1}, it holds for all value functions.

A.4 Proof of Lemma 5.1

We prove Lemma 5.1 by induction. The proposition is true for V_0 because $V_0(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$. Now, suppose that the proposition holds for the kth value function V_k and that $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ satisfies the assumptions in Lemma 5.1. We then show that (21) holds for the $(k+1)$th value function V_{k+1} in each case depending on the optimal actions of kth value iteration on $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{w}$ as follows.

I. Both optimal actions are same.

With out loss of generality, assume that both optimal actions are serving queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. Then, the RHS

of (21) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{z})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{w})\\
&= \; c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+z_\mu>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+z_\nu>0\}}\\
&\quad +\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\
&\quad +c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+w_\mu>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+w_\nu>0\}}\\
&\quad +\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\
&= \; c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+z_\mu>0\}}+\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+w_\mu>0\}})\\
&\quad +c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+z_\nu>0\}}+\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+w_\nu>0\}})\\
&\quad +\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{z}')+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{w}')],
\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

where $\mathbf{Q}:=(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A}$, $\mathbf{z}':=(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ -(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$, $\mathbf{w}':=(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ -(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$.
On the other hand, by the definition of value iteration, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{x})+V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{y})\\
&\geq \; c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+x_\mu>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+x_\nu>0\}}\\
&\quad +\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\
&\quad +c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+y_\mu>0\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+y_\nu>0\}}\\
&\quad +\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k((\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ +\boldsymbol{A})]\\
&= \; c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+x_\mu>0\}}+\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+y_\mu>0\}})\\
&\quad +c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+x_\nu>0\}}+\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+y_\nu>0\}})\\
&\quad +\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{x}')+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{y}')],
\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

where $\mathbf{x}':=(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ -(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$, $\mathbf{y}':=(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ -(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}-\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$. Next, comparing the RHS of the above equations, since $\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{z}+\mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\mathbf{w}\in\{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+x_\mu>0\}}+I_{\{q_\mu+y_\mu>0\}})&=c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+z_\mu>0\}}+\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+w_\mu>0\}}),\\
c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+x_\nu>0\}}+\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+y_\nu>0\}})&=c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+z_\nu>0\}}+\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+w_\nu>0\}}),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus the first two equations in (23) and (24) are the same.
For the last part, it is readily verified that $\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{y}',\mathbf{z}',\mathbf{w}'\in\{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\mathbf{x}'\leq\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, $\mathbf{y}'\leq\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}+\mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$, and $\mathbf{x}'+\mathbf{y}'=\mathbf{z}'+\mathbf{w}'$, which implies that

$$V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{z}')+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{w}')\leq V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{x}')+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{y}')$$

because V_k satisfies Lemma 5.1 (induction hypothesis).

Hence, (21) holds for V_{k+1} in this case.

II. Both optimal actions are different from each other.
With out loss of generality, assume that the optimal action on $(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{z})$ are serving queues $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. Then, as before, the RHS and LHS of (21) become

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{z})+V_{n+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{w})\\
&= \; c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+z_\mu\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+z_\nu\}}\\
&\quad +c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\rho+w_\rho\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\omega+w_\omega\}}\\
&\quad +\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{z}')+V_k(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{w}')]
\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{x})+V_{n+1}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{y})\\
&\geq \; c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu+x_\mu\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu+x_\nu\}}\\
&\quad +c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\rho+y_\rho\}}+c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\cdot\mathbb{I}_{\{q_\omega+y_\omega\}}\\
&\quad +\beta\,\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{x}')+V_n(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{y}')],
\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

where $\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ + \boldsymbol{A}$, $\mathbf{x}' = (\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$, $\mathbf{y}' = (\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+$, $\mathbf{z}' = (\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+ - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})^+$, $\mathbf{w}' = (\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+ - (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})^+$. Now, we calculate the terms involving $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ in (25) and in (26) for each case:

i. If $x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = z_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, then $w_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0$ because $y_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0$, and thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu + x_\mu > 0\}} &= c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu + z_\mu > 0\}}, \\ x'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + y'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} &= z'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + w'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}. \end{aligned}$$

ii. Suppose that $x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} > z_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} > 0$. Then, since $x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + y_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = z_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + w_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $y_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0$, we have $w_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 1$, and therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu + x_\mu > 0\}} = c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu + z_\mu > 0\}} &= c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \\ x'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + y'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} &= z'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + w'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from $x'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = z'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + 1$ and $y'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = w'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$.

iii. Lastly, assume that $x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 1$, $z_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0$, $w_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 1$, and $q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} &c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu + x_\mu > 0\}} = c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \quad c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu + z_\mu > 0\}} = 0, \\ &x'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = y'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = z'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0, \quad w'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathbf{w}'' = \mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. Then, we have $x'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + y'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = z'_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + w''_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, and from the trivial boundary Proposition we obtain $V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{w}') \le c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{w}'')$.

In summary, upon letting

$$\mathbf{w}'' := \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}' & \text{if } x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = z_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \\ \mathbf{w}' & \text{if } x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} > z_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \text{ and } q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 1 \\ \mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{e}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} & \text{if } x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} > z_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \text{ and } q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = 0 \end{cases},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{z}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{w}) \le\ & c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu + x_\mu\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu + z_\nu\}} \\ & + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\rho + w_\rho\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\omega + w_\omega\}} \\ & + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{z}') + V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{w}'')], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{z}' + \mathbf{w}''.$$

Repeating these steps for other components, yields $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}, \widehat{\mathbf{z}} \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ such that $\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}' = \widehat{\mathbf{z}} + \widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{z}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{w}) &\le c_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\mu + x_\mu\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\nu + x_\nu\}} \\ &\quad + c_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{q_\rho + y_\rho\}} + c_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{y_\omega + w_\omega\}} \\ &\quad + \beta\, \mathbb{E}[V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{x}') + V_k(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{y}')] \\ &\le V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{x}) + V_{k+1}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows from the induction hypothesis and the third equation follows from (26).

Hence, the $(k+1)$th value function V_{k+1} satisfies (21) and Lemma 5.1 holds.